



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/530,233	04/26/2000	PHILIPPE SEGUELA	641050.90021	3952
959	7590 08/26/2005		EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP.			PAK, MICHAEL D	
28 STATE ST BOSTON, M			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
•			1646	
			DATE MAILED: 08/26/2009	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/530,233	SEGUELA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Michael Pak	1646			
The MAILING DATA Period for Reply	E of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE MAILING DATE OF - Extensions of time may be availa after SIX (6) MONTHS from the n - If the period for reply specified ab - If NO period for reply is specified - Failure to reply within the set or e	THIS COMMUNICATION. ble under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 nailing date of this communication. ove is less than thirty (30) days, a reply above, the maximum statutory period watended period for reply will, by statute, ater than three months after the mailing	If IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to com	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 May 2005</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINA	L. 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.				
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4a) Of the above classified 5)	is/are rejected.	vn from consideration.	•			
Application Papers						
9) The specification is	objected to by the Examiner	г.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
<u> </u>	• • •	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj aminer. Note the attached Office				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19		•			
12) Acknowledgment is a) All b) Some * 1. Certified copi 2. Certified copi 3. Copies of the application from	made of a claim for foreign c) None of: es of the priority documents certified copies of the prior om the International Bureau	s have been received in Application ity documents have been received	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (P		4) Interview Summary				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Pater3) Information Disclosure Statem	nt Drawing Review (PTO-948) ent(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5). Notice of Informal P	ate atent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other:	·			

Me

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- 1. Amendment filed 31 May 2005 has been entered. Claims 16-21 and 38-42 are pending.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 31 May 2005 have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 38, 40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims recite or encompass the term "85% identical" and "human" which is ambiguous and the metes and bounds of the term is not clear. The term "% identical" is a relative term whose metes and bounds are not clear because one skilled in the art requires specific algorithms in order to calculate % identity. Applicants argue that the % identity alignment provided by the examiner is incorrect because the applicants' alignment gives different results. Thus, the metes and bounds of the term % identity is ambiguous without the specific algorithm reicitation in the claims. Furthermore, it is not

Application/Control Number: 09/530,233

Art Unit: 1646

clear to one skilled in the art when an "85% identical" polypeptide is human or when it is not human or any other species unless it is the specific human species of SEQ ID NO:2 disclosed in the specification.

5. Claims 38, 40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

The claims recite "85% identical" and "human" which encompass variants of SEQ ID NO:2 as well as the claimed limitation of being "human". However, one skilled in the art cannot envision all the various species of peptide which is "human" and "85% identity with SEQ ID NO:2 with the function of being inhibited by amelioride". The specification discloses the specific species of SEQ ID NO:2 and the claims encompass a large number of species which cannot be envisioned and whose function is not specifically defined. While the species of SEQ ID NO:2 is human and functions to inhibit amelioride, one skilled in the art cannot envision the difference in structure from SEQ ID NO:2 which provides the characteristic of being human. *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. (CAFC) 43 USPQ2d 1398* held that a generic claim to human or mammalian when only the rat protein sequence was disclosed did not have written description in the specification. Thus, the genus of polycucleotide structure cannot be envisioned.

Priority

6. Applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a-d) is acknowledged. However, the foreign application upon which priority is claimed fails to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for claims 38, 40 and 42 of this application for the reasons provided above in the 35 USC 112 rejections. See MPEP 706.02.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. Claims 38, 40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by DeWeille et al. (US 6,287,859).

DeWeille et al. disclose the proton gated cation channel from sensory neurons (SEQ ID NO: 14) which has 99.4% amino acid sequence identity with SEQ ID NO: 2. The channels of DeWeille et al. inherently have the P2X2 ATP channel activity as well as the functional activity including amelioride inhibition. The channels of DeWeille et al. inherently belong to the degenerin family.

Applicants argue that presently claimed subject matter has priority date earlier than the earliest priority date of February 11, 1998 of DeWeille et al. However, the priority has been denied as discussed above.

8. Claims 38, 40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Renard et al. (US 2002/0173000).

Renard et al. disclose the proton gated cation channel from sensory neurons (SEQ ID NO: 6) which has 94.9% amino acid sequence identity with SEQ ID NO: 2.

Art Unit: 1646

The channels of Renard et al. inherently have the P2X2 ATP channel activity as well as the functional activity including amelioride inhibition. The channels of Renard et al. inherently belong to the degenerin family.

Applicants argue that presently claimed subject matter has priority date earlier than the earliest priority date of May 15, 1998 of Renard et al. However, the priority has been denied as discussed above.

- 9. Claims 16-21 and 41are allowed.
- 10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/530,233 Page 6

Art Unit: 1646

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael Pak whose telephone number is 571-272-0879.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached on 571-272-0829. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306

for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-

1600.

Michael Pak

Primary Examiner

Hicharl D. AHL

Art Unit 1646

August 22, 2005